arXiv:1605.02820v2 [math.PR] 16 Sep 2016

The Itô SDEs and Fokker–Planck equations with Osgood and Sobolev coefficients

Dejun Luo*

Key Laboratory of Random Complex Structures and Data Sciences,
Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

Abstract

We study the degenerated Itô SDE on $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose drift coefficient only fulfills a mixed Osgood and Sobolev regularity. Under suitable assumptions on the gradient of the diffusion coefficient and on the divergence of the drift coefficient, we prove the existence and uniqueness of generalized stochastic flows associated to such equations. We also prove the uniqueness of solutions to the corresponding Fokker–Planck equation by using the probabilistic method.

Keywords: Stochastic differential equation, Osgood and Sobolev condition, DiPerna–Lions theory, Fokker–Planck equation, stochastic flow

MSC 2010: Primary 60H10; secondary 35Q84

1 Introduction

Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathcal{M}_{d\times m}$ be a matrix-valued function and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ a vector field on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We consider the following stochastic differential equation (SDE for short)

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \sigma(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}B_t + b(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t, \tag{1.1}$$

where B_t is an m-dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. According to the classical theory on SDE, if σ and b are globally Lipschitz continuous, then the equation (1.1) generates a unique stochastic flow X_t of homeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. In the pioneer work [35], Malliavin constructed the canonical Brownian motion on the diffeomorphism group of the circle S^1, see [14] for a more detailed construction and [1] for the explicit modulus of Hölder continuity of the flow associated to the canonical Brownian motion. Since then, there have been intensive studies on SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients, see for instance [19, 36, 15, 20, 37, 41]. In particular, the existence of a unique strong solution to (1.1) was proved in [20] under the general Osgood type condition. In the case that the coefficients have the log-Lipschitz continuity, X. Zhang [41] established the homeomorphic property of the stochastic flow by following Kunita's approach (cf. [29, Section 4.5]).

If $\sigma \equiv 0$, then (1.1) reduces to an ordinary differential equation (abbreviated as ODE):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}X_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = b(X_t). \tag{1.2}$$

In recent years, the study of ODEs with weakly differentiable coefficients attracted lots of attentions, see e.g. [12, 2, 10] for the finite dimensional case, [4, 17, 39] for extensions on the Wiener

*Email: luodj@amss.ac.cn. The author is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11571347), the Seven Main Directions (Y129161ZZ1) and the Special Talent Program of the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

space, [13, 43, 16] for studies on Riemannian manifolds. The readers can find a survey of some of these results in [3]. In these works (except [43]), the existence and uniqueness of quasi-invariant flows X_t generated by (1.2) are deduced from the well-posedness of the corresponding transport equation or the continuity equation. By making use of the pointwise characterization of Sobolev functions in $W^{1,p}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (see (2.4) below), Crippa and de Lellis [11] are able to give a direct construction of the flow X_t. This method was developed in [9] to show the well posedness of (1.2) when the gradient of b is given by some singular integral. Following this direct method, there are also studies on the SDE (1.1) with coefficients having Sobolev regularity [42, 18, 44, 34]. Regarding the corresponding PDE, Le Bris and Lions studied in [30] the Fokker–Planck type equations with Sobolev coefficients; using Ambrosio's commutator estimate for BV vector fields, their results was slightly extended in [32] to the case where the drift coefficient has only BV regularity. Based on a representation formula for the solutions to Fokker–Planck equations (see [22, Theorem 2.6]), the uniqueness was established in [38, 33] when the coefficients are bounded and have weak spatial regularity.

This paper is a continuation of the work [31], where the authors propose a unified framework for ODEs (1.2) under the mixed Osgood and Sobolev conditions on the coefficient b. The spaces consist of these kind of functions have been studied intensively in the past two decades, even in the case where the underlying space is the general metric measure space (motivated by the pioneer work [24]); see [26] for the equivalence of different Sobolev spaces and [27] for the compactness of embeddings of Sobolev type. Our purpose is to extend the main results in [31] to the case of the Itô SDE (1.1). Compared to equation (1.2), a big difference in the stochastic setting is that the estimate of the Radon–Nikodym density involves the gradient of the diffusion coefficient σ (see e.g. Lemma 3.4 in the current paper), which implies that σ naturally has some Sobolev regularity. Therefore, the mixed Osgood and Sobolev regularity can only be imposed on the drift coefficient b in (1.1). The first main result of this paper also extends [34, Theorem 2.3], in which the drift coefficient b is required to be in the first order Sobolev space. We remark that when the equation (1.1) has non-degenerate diffusion coefficient σ, the existence of a unique strong solution can be proved under quite weak conditions on the drift b, see [28, 21] for integrability conditions and [23, 40] for weak continuity conditions.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first give the meaning of the generalized stochastic flow associated to (1.1), then we state the mixed Osgood and Sobolev condition $(\mathbf{H}_q)\,(q \geq 1)$ and provide an example of functions satisfying such condition. The main results consist of three theorems: the first one (Theorem 2.3) allows the diffusion coefficient σ to be in some Sobolev space but requires that b fulfills $(\mathbf{H}_q)$ with $q > 1$; in Theorem 2.5, we assume $(\mathbf{H}_1)$ on the drift b and that σ is smooth, which is mainly due to the estimate of the Radon–Nikodym density of stochastic flows; the last main result (Theorem 2.7) proves the uniqueness of the related Fokker–Planck equation under the Sobolev regularity on σ and the mixed Osgood and Sobolev condition $(\mathbf{H}_1)$ on b. The subsequent three sections are devoted to the proofs of these theorems, respectively.

2 Preparations and main results

First, we present the precise definition of the generalized stochastic flow (cf. [18, Definition 5.1] and [44, Definition 2.1]) associated to (1.1). As usual, the space of continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let μ be a locally finite measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{L}^d$. For a measurable map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $\varphi_{\#}\mu = \mu \circ \varphi^{-1}$ for the push-forward of μ by φ (also called the distribution of φ under μ).

Definition 2.1. *A measurable map $X\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called a μ-a.e. stochastic flow*

associated to the Itô SDE (1.1) *if*

(i) *for each* $t \in [0,T]$ *and almost all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega \to X_t(\omega,x)$ *is measurable with respect to* $\mathcal{F}_t$, *i.e., the natural filtration generated by the Brownian motion* $\{B_s\colon s \le t\}$;

(ii) *there exists a nonnegative function* $K : [0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that for each* $t \in [0,T]$, $(X_t(\omega,\cdot))_{\#}\mu = K_t\mu$;

(iii) *for* $(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)$*-a.e.* (ω,x),

$$\int_0^T |\sigma(X_s(\omega,x))|^2\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^T |b(X_s(\omega,x))|\,\mathrm{d}s < +\infty;$$

(iv) *for* μ*-a.e.* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *the integral equation below holds almost surely:*

$$X_t(\omega,x) = x + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s(\omega,x))\,\mathrm{d}B_s + \int_0^t b(X_s(\omega,x))\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad \textit{for all } t\in[0,T].$$

Throughout this paper, we fix a nondecreasing function $\rho \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}_+)$ which satisfies $\rho(0) = 0$ and $\int_{0+} \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\rho(s)} = \infty$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\rho(s) \ge s$ for all $s \ge 0$. Typical examples for the function $\rho(s)$ are s, $s\log\frac{1}{s}$, $s(\log\frac{1}{s})(\log\log\frac{1}{s}),\cdots$. Although the latter two functions are only well defined on a small neighborhood of the origin, we can extend them to the whole positive half line by piecing them together with linear functions. For example,

$$\rho(s) = \begin{cases} s\log\frac{1}{s}, & s\in[0,e^{-2}];\\ s+e^{-2}, & s\in(e^{-2},\infty). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Alternatively, one can directly use $\rho(s) = s\log\big(\frac{1}{s}+e\big)$. For any $\delta>0$, we define the following auxiliary function

$$\psi_\delta(\xi) = \int_0^\xi \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\rho(s)+\delta}, \quad \xi>0.$$

Note that $\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\psi_\delta(\xi) = \infty$ for all $\xi>0$. Moreover,

$$\psi_\delta'(\xi) = \frac{1}{\rho(\xi)+\delta} > 0, \quad \psi_\delta''(\xi) = -\frac{\rho'(\xi)}{(\rho(\xi)+\delta)^2} \le 0. \tag{2.2}$$

This property shows that ψ_δ is a concave function for any $\delta>0$. If $\rho(s)\equiv s$ for all $s\ge 0$, then $\psi_\delta(\xi) = \log\big(1+\frac{\xi}{\delta}\big)$ which is the auxiliary function used in the previous works [11, 42, 18, 34].

Let $q \ge 1$ be fixed. We are now ready to introduce the following hypothesis.

($\mathbf{H}_q$) For any $R>0$, there exist a nonnegative function $g_R \in L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and negligible subset N, such that for all $x,y\notin N$ with $|x-y|\le R$, one has

$$|\langle x-y, b(x)-b(y)\rangle| \le \big(g_R(x)+g_R(y)\big)\rho(|x-y|^2). \tag{2.3}$$

Here is an example of functions satisfying ($\mathbf{H}_q$).

Example 2.2. Take $b_1 \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}^d)$. If $q=1$, we require further that $|\nabla b_1| \in (L^1\log L^1)_{loc}$. It is well known that

$$|b_1(x)-b_1(y)| \le C_d\big(M_R|\nabla b_1|(x)+M_R|\nabla b_1|(y)\big)|x-y| \quad \text{for a.e. } x,y \text{ with } |x-y|\le R, \tag{2.4}$$

where C_d is a dimensional constant and $M_R|\nabla b_1|$ is the local maximal function of $|\nabla b_1|$:

$$M_R|\nabla b_1|(x) = \sup_{0<r\le R} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^d(B_r)} \int_{B_r} |\nabla b_1|(x+y)\,\mathrm{d}y, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

in which B_r is the ball centered at origin with radius r. Moreover, for any $\lambda > 0$, if $q = 1$, then

$$\int_{B_\lambda} M_R|\nabla b_1|(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_d \int_{B_{R+\lambda}} |\nabla b_1(x)| \log(1 + |\nabla b_1(x)|)\,\mathrm{d}x;$$

while if $q > 1$, then

$$\int_{B_\lambda} \big(M_R|\nabla b_1|(x)\big)^q\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_{d,q} \int_{B_{R+\lambda}} |\nabla b_1(x)|^q\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.5}$$

Next, let $b_2(x) = (V(x_1), \cdots, V(x_d))$ with

$$V(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\sin kt|}{k^2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then by [20, (2.12)], we have

$$|b_2(x) - b_2(y)| \le C_0 d\rho(|x-y|) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\rho(s)$ is given in (2.1). Now it is easy to show that the vector field $b = b_1 + b_2$ satisfies $(\mathbf{H}_q)$ with $g_R = C_d'(1 + M_R|\nabla b_1|)$.

To simplify notations, we write $\bar{b}(x) = \frac{b(x)}{1+|x|}$ and $\bar{\sigma}(x) = \frac{\sigma(x)}{1+|x|}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Our first main result extends [34, Theorem 2.3].

Theorem 2.3. *Let $q > 1$ and $\mathrm{d}\mu(x) = (1+|x|^2)^{-q-(d+1)/2}\,\mathrm{d}x$. Assume that*

(i) *$\sigma \in W^{1,2}_{loc}$ and b satisfies $(\mathbf{H}_q)$ and the distributional divergence $\mathrm{div}(b)$ exists;*

(ii) *for any $p > 0$, one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\big\{p\big[(\mathrm{div}(b))^- + |\bar{b}| + |\bar{\sigma}|^2 + |\nabla\sigma|^2\big]\big\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu < +\infty. \tag{2.6}$$

Then there exists a unique μ-a.e. stochastic flow X_t associated to the Itô SDE (1.1). Moreover, the Radon–Nikodym density $K_t := \frac{\mathrm{d}[(X_t)_{\#}\mu]}{\mathrm{d}\mu}$ of the flow X_t belongs to $L^\infty([0,T], L^p(\mathbb{P}\times\mu))$ for any $p > 1$.

Remark 2.4. The condition (2.6) has the following consequences:

(a) By the Sobolev embedding theorem, the diffusion coefficient σ is Hölder continuous.

(b) As noted in [34, Remark 2.2(ii)], the condition (2.6) implies $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{b} \in L^p(\mu)$ for any $p > 1$. Moreover, by the choice of the measure μ, if p is sufficiently big, then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(1+|x|)^{2qp/(p-1)}\,\mathrm{d}\mu < +\infty$. Hölder's inequality yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma|^{2q}\,\mathrm{d}\mu \le \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\bar{\sigma}|^{2qp}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\bigg]^{1/p} \bigg[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+|x|)^{2qp/(p-1)}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\bigg]^{(p-1)/p} < +\infty.$$

Thus $\sigma \in L^{2q}(\mu)$. In the same way we have $b \in L^{2q}(\mu)$.

Theorem 2.3 will be proved in Section 3. Under the assumption $(\mathbf{H}_1)$, we need stronger conditions on the diffusion coefficient σ.

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that*

(i) *the diffusion coefficient $\sigma \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{M}_{d\times m})$, i.e. it is bounded with bounded spatial derivatives up to order two;*

(ii) *the drift coefficient $b \in L^1_{loc}$ satisfies $(\mathbf{H}_1)$ and the distributional divergence $\mathrm{div}(b)$ exists such that*

$$[\mathrm{div}(b)]^- \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \bar{b} \in L^\infty(B_r^c) \quad \text{for some } r > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Then there exists a unique $\mathcal{L}^d$-a.e. stochastic flow X_t generated by Itô SDE (1.1).

Recall that $\bar{b}(x) = \frac{b(x)}{1+|x|}$ and B_r^c is the complement of the ball B_r. By (2.7), b can be locally unbounded. This result has two main differences from [44, Theorem 2.2]: (1) the assumption on σ is stronger here, but it is much easier to be checked; (2) the $W^{1,1}_{loc}$-regularity of the drift b is replaced by $(\mathbf{H}_1)$.

The Itô SDE (1.1) is closely related to the Fokker–Planck equation

$$\partial_t \mu_t = L^* \mu_t, \quad \mu|_{t=0} = \mu_0, \tag{2.8}$$

where L^* is the adjoint operator of L defined as

$$L\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}\varphi(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d b^i(x)\partial_i\varphi(x), \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.9}$$

Here $a^{ij}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma^{ik}(x)\sigma^{jk}(x)$, $\partial_i\varphi(x) = \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x_i}(x)$ and $\partial_{ij}\varphi(x) = \frac{\partial^2\varphi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(x)$, $1 \le i, j \le d$. This equation is understood as follows: for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L\varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(x),$$

where the initial condition means that μ_t weakly$*$ converges to μ_0 as t tends to 0. If μ_t is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure with the density function u_t for all $t \in [0, T]$, then the density function u_t solves the PDE below in the weak sense:

$$\partial_t u_t = L^* u_t, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0. \tag{2.10}$$

The next result is a direct consequence of the Itô formula.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2.5. Let $(X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ be the generalized stochastic flow associated to (1.1) and K_t the Radon–Nikodym density of $(X_t)_\# \mathcal{L}^d$ with respect to $\mathcal{L}^d$. Then $u_t(x) := \mathbb{E}K_t(x)$ solves the Fokker–Planck equation (2.10) with $u_0 = 1$.*

Our main purpose is to show the uniqueness of the Fokker–Planck equation (2.10) in a suitable space, following the ideas in [38, 33]. This approach is a probabilistic one, based on Figalli's formula (see [22, Theorem 2.6]) which represents the solution to the Fokker–Planck equation (2.8) in terms of the martingale solution corresponding to the Itô SDE (1.1). Note that this representation formula is only valid for bounded coefficients σ and b (see [8, p. 149] for related discussions). Nevertheless, it enables us to treat the degenerate case. We remark that there are many works dealing with various kind of non-degenerate equations [5, 7, 8]. The recent book [6] presents a comprehensive study on Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations.

We introduce the following condition on the diffusion coefficient:

($\mathbf{H}_\sigma$) For any $R>0$, there exist a nonnegative function $\tilde{g}_R \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and negligible subset N, such that for all $x, y \notin N$ with $|x-y| \le R$, one has

$$\|\sigma(x)-\sigma(y)\|^2 \le \big(\tilde{g}_R(x)+\tilde{g}_R(y)\big)\rho(|x-y|^2). \tag{2.11}$$

By (2.4) and (2.5) ($q=2$), it is clear that if σ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}_{loc}$, then the above condition holds with $\tilde{g}_R = 2C_d^2(M_R|\nabla\sigma|)^2$ and $\rho(s)=s$. Here is the last main result of this work which slightly generalizes [38, Theorem 1.1].

Theorem 2.7 (Uniqueness of Fokker–Planck equations). *Assume that the coefficients σ and b are essentially bounded. Moreover, the hypotheses ($\mathbf{H}_\sigma$) and ($\mathbf{H}_1$) hold for σ and b respectively. Then for any given probability density function $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there is at most one weak solution u_t to the Fokker–Planck equation (2.10) in the class $L^\infty\big([0,T], L^1\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\big)$ with $u_0 = f$.*

3 Proof of Theorem 2.3

First we prove an a-priori moment estimate on the solution flow X_t to (1.1). This improves the result presented in [34, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 3.1 (Moment estimate). *Assume that $q>1$ and $\sigma, b \in L^{2q}(\mu)$. Let X_t be a μ-a.e. stochastic flow associated to Itô SDE (1.1), and K_t the Radon–Nikodym density with respect to μ. If for some $q_1 \in [1,q)$, one has*

$$\Lambda_{q,q_1,T} := \sup_{0\le t\le T} \|K_t\|_{L^{q/(q-q_1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)} < +\infty, \tag{3.1}$$

then we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T} |X_t(x)|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x) \le C_{d,q_1} + C_{q_1,T}\Lambda_{q,q_1,T}\big(\|\sigma\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)} + \|b\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}\big).$$

Proof. For any $R>0$, define the stopping time $\tau_R(x) = \inf\{t>0 : |X_t(x)| \ge R\}$. To simplify notations, we shall omit the space variable x in $X_s(x)$ and $\tau_R(x)$. The Itô formula yields

$$|X_{t\wedge\tau_R}|^2 = |x|^2 + 2\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R} \langle X_s, \sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s\rangle + 2\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s, b(X_s)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Hence there is $C_{q_1}>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}|X_{t\wedge\tau_R}|^{2q_1} \le C_{q_1}\bigg[&|x|^{2q_1} + \bigg|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s,\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s\rangle\bigg|^{q_1} + \bigg|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s, b(X_s)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg|^{q_1}\\ &+\bigg(\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1}\bigg].\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

By Burkholder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T}\bigg|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s,\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s\rangle\bigg|^{q_1} &\le C'_{q_1}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|\sigma(X_s)^*X_s|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1/2}\bigg]\\ &\le C'_{q_1}\,\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sup_{s\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_s|^{q_1}\bigg)\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1/2}\bigg].\end{aligned}$$

Cauchy's inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s,\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s\rangle\right|^{q_1}\le\frac{1}{3C_{q_1}}\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_s|^{2q_1}+C'_{q_1,T}\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.3}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s,b(X_s)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}s\right|^{q_1}&\le\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|\langle X_s,b(X_s)\rangle|\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1}\\&\le\mathbb{E}\bigg[\Big(\sup_{s\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_s|^{q_1}\Big)\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b(X_s)|\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1}\bigg].\end{aligned}$$

Again by Cauchy's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\langle X_s,b(X_s)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}s\right|^{q_1}&\le\frac{1}{3C_{q_1}}\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_s|^{2q_1}+C''_{q_1}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b(X_s)|\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{2q_1}\\&\le\frac{1}{3C_{q_1}}\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_s|^{2q_1}+C''_{q_1,T}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}|b(X_s)|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T}\bigg(\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^{q_1}\le\tilde{C}_{q_1,T}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\|\sigma(X_s)\|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that $\sup_{t\le T}|X_{t\wedge\tau_R}|^{2q_1}=\sup_{t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_t|^{2q_1}$. Combining (3.2)–(3.5), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_t|^{2q_1}\le 3C_{q_1}|x|^{2q_1}+C_{q_1,T}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\big(\|\sigma(X_s)\|^{2q_1}+|b(X_s)|^{2q_1}\big)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Integrating both sides on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to μ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_t|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}\mu&\le C_{d,q_1}+C_{q_1,T}\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\big(\|\sigma(X_s)\|^{2q_1}+|b(X_s)|^{2q_1}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s\\&\le C_{d,q_1}+C_{q_1,T}\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(\|\sigma(y)\|^{2q_1}+|b(y)|^{2q_1}\big)K_s(y)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{d,q_1}=3C_{q_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|x|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)<+\infty$. Using Hölder's inequality and (3.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|X_t|^{2q_1}\,\mathrm{d}\mu&\le C_{d,q_1}+C_{q_1,T}\big(\|\sigma\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}+\|b\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}\big)T\sup_{s\le T}\|K_s\|_{L^{q/(q-q_1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)}\\&\le C_{d,q_1}+C_{q_1,T}T\Lambda_{q,q_1,T}\big(\|\sigma\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}+\|b\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Since the right hand side is independent of $R>0$, Fatou's lemma allows us to let $R\to\infty$ to get the desired estimate. □

Next we provide a stability estimate which will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Recall the definition of the auxiliary function ψ_δ for $\delta>0$ in Section 2. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,T}$ the uniform norm in $C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 3.2 (Stability estimate). *Assume that $\sigma,\tilde{\sigma}\in L^{2q}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathcal{M}_{d\times m})$ and $b,\tilde{b}\in L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, σ and b satisfy the condition* (i) *in Theorem 2.3. Let X_t (resp. $\tilde{X}_t$) be the stochastic*

flow associated to the Itô SDE (1.1) *with coefficients* σ *and* b *(resp.* $\tilde{\sigma}$ *and* $\tilde{b}$*). Denote by* K_t *(resp.* $\tilde{K}_t$*) the Radon–Nikodym density of* X_t *(resp.* $\tilde{X}_t$*) with respect to* μ*. Assume that*

$$\Lambda_{q,T} := \sup_{0\le t\le T} \big[\|K_t\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)} \vee \|\tilde{K}_t\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)}\big] < +\infty. \tag{3.6}$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R} \psi_\delta\big(\|X-\tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\
&\le C_{d,R,T}\big(\Lambda_{q,T}\wedge\sqrt{\Lambda_{q,T}}\,\big)\bigg[\frac{1}{\delta}\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\Big(\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \|b-\tilde{b}\|_{L^q(B_R)}\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \|\nabla\sigma\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|g_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)}\bigg],
\end{aligned}$$

where $G_R(\omega) := \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : \|X_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T}\vee\|\tilde{X}_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T}\le R\big\}$*, and* $L^q(B_R)$ *is the usual function space with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the ball* $B_R=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : |x|\le R\}$*.*

Proof. We follow the line of arguments of [18, Theorem 5.2]. Denote by $Z_t = X_t - \tilde{X}_t$ and $\xi_t = |Z_t|^2$ where we omit the space variable x. Itô's formula leads to

$$\mathrm{d}\xi_t = 2\langle Z_t, (\sigma(X_t)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_t))\,\mathrm{d}B_t\rangle + 2\langle Z_t, b(X_t)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_t)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + \|\sigma(X_t)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_t)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Applying again the Itô formula and by (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\psi_\delta(\xi_t) &\le 2\frac{\langle Z_t, (\sigma(X_t)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_t))\,\mathrm{d}B_t\rangle}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta} + 2\frac{\langle Z_t, b(X_t)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_t)\rangle}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\|\sigma(X_t)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_t)\|^2}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&=: \mathrm{d}I_1(t) + \mathrm{d}I_2(t) + \mathrm{d}I_3(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

We first estimate the term $I_1(t)$. Define the stopping time $\tau_R(x) = \inf\{t>0 : |X_t(x)|\vee|\tilde{X}_t(x)|>R\}$. Note that a.s. $G_R\subset B_R$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu \le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu. \tag{3.8}$$

By Burkholder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|I_1(t)|^2 &\le 4\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\frac{\big|(\sigma(X_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s))^*Z_s\big|^2}{(\rho(\xi_s)+\delta)^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\le 4\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}$$

since $\rho(\xi)\ge\xi\ge 0$. Cauchy's inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le \int_{B_R} 2\bigg[\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2}\mathrm{d}\mu \\
&\le C_{d,R}\bigg[\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}\mu\bigg]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{d,R} = 2(\mu(B_R))^{1/2}$. It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_R} |I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le C_{d,R}\bigg[\int_{B_R} \mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} \frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\sigma(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}\mu\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C_{d,R}\bigg[\int_{B_R} \mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} \frac{\|\sigma(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}\mu\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &=: I_{1,1} + I_{1,2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We have by Hölder's inequality and (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,2} &\le \frac{C_{d,R}}{\sqrt{\delta}}\bigg[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\|\sigma(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le \frac{C_{d,R}}{\sqrt{\delta}}\bigg[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \|\sigma(y)-\tilde{\sigma}(y)\|^2\tilde{K}_s(y)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le \frac{C_{d,R}}{\sqrt{\delta}}\sqrt{T\Lambda_{q,T}}\,\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^{2q}(B_R)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where in the last step we used the fact that the measure μ is smaller than the Lebesgue measure. Next, by (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &= C_{d,R}\bigg[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\sigma(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le C'_{d,R}\bigg[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\big[M_{2R}|\nabla\sigma|(X_s)+M_{2R}|\nabla\sigma|(\tilde{X}_s)\big]^2\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le \sqrt{2}\,C'_{d,R}\bigg[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big[M_{2R}|\nabla\sigma|(y)\big]^2\big(K_s(y)+\tilde{K}_s(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hölder's inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &\le \sqrt{2}\,C'_{d,R}\bigg[\int_0^T 2\Lambda_{q,T}\bigg(\int_{B_R}\big[M_{2R}|\nabla\sigma|(y)\big]^{2q}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\bigg)^{1/q}\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le C''_{d,R}\sqrt{T\Lambda_{q,T}}\|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we have used the maximal inequality (2.5). Combining this inequality with (3.8)–(3.10), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu \le \bar{C}_{d,R,T}\sqrt{\Lambda_{q,T}}\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})}\bigg). \tag{3.11}$$

Next, we treat the second term $I_2(t)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\int_{G_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_R}|I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\le 2\,\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R}\frac{|\langle Z_s, b(X_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= 2\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}}\frac{|\langle Z_s, b(X_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\langle Z_s, b(X_s) - \tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle| \le |\langle Z_s, b(X_s) - b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle| + |\langle Z_s, b(\tilde{X}_s) - \tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|$. We deduce from $(\mathbf{H}_q)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}} \frac{|\langle Z_s, b(X_s) - b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}} \big[g_{2R}(X_s) + g_{2R}(\tilde{X}_s)\big]\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} g_{2R}(y)\big[K_s(y) + \tilde{K}_s(y)\big]\,\mathrm{d}\mu,\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (3.6), gives us

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}} \frac{|\langle Z_s, b(X_s) - b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s \le 2T\Lambda_{q,T}\|g_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)}.$$

Moreover, since $\rho(s) \ge s$ for all $s \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}} \frac{|\langle Z_s, b(\tilde{X}_s) - \tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s &\le \int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_R>s\}} \frac{|b(\tilde{X}_s) - \tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)|}{\sqrt{\xi_s+\delta}}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} |b(y) - \tilde{b}(y)|\tilde{K}_s(y)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{T\Lambda_{q,T}}{\sqrt{\delta}}\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^q(B_R)}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu \le 2T\Lambda_{q,T}\bigg(2\|g_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\|b - \tilde{b}\|_{L^q(B_R)}\bigg). \tag{3.12}$$

Finally, similar to the treatment of the terms on the right hand side of (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |I_3(t)|\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} \frac{\|\sigma(X_s) - \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\le \bar{C}_{d,R,T}\Lambda_{q,T}\bigg(\frac{1}{\delta}\|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \|\nabla\sigma\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})}\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (3.11) and (3.12), we obtain the desired result. □

The uniqueness part of Theorem 2.3 follows directly from Lemma 3.2.

Corollary 3.3 (Uniqueness). *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.3, there exists at most one μ-a.e. stochastic flow associated to the Itô SDE* (1.1).

Proof. Assume there are two stochastic flows $(X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ and $(\tilde{X}_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ associated to the Itô SDE (1.1). For any $R > 0$, applying Lemma 3.2 with $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma$ and $\tilde{b} = b$ leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{G_R} \psi_\delta\big(\|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu \le \tilde{C}_{d,R,T} < +\infty, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\tilde{C}_{d,R,T}$ depends on $\Lambda_{q,T}$ and $\|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})}$, $\|g_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)}$. For any $\eta \in (0,1)$, let $\Theta_\eta(\omega) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|X_\cdot(\omega,x) - \tilde{X}_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T} \le \eta\}$. Then by Lemma 3.1 with $q_1 = 1$ and (3.13),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu &\le \mathbb{E}\big[\mu(G_R^c)\big] + \mathbb{E}\int_{G_R} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\le \frac{C_{d,T}}{R^2} + \eta^2\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \mathbb{E}\int_{G_R\cap\Theta_\eta^c} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &\le \frac{C_{d,T}}{R^2} + \eta^2\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \frac{\tilde{C}_{d,R,T}}{\psi_\delta(\eta^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

We first let $\delta \downarrow 0$, then let $R \uparrow \infty$ and $\eta \downarrow 0$ to get

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\, \mathrm{d}\mu = 0,$$

which yields the uniqueness of stochastic flows associated to (1.1). □

To prove the existence part of Theorem 2.3, we shall regularize the coefficients σ and b as usual. Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_+)$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi \,\mathrm{d}x = 1$ and its support $\mathrm{supp}(\chi) \subset B_1$. For $n \geq 1$, define $\chi_n(x) = n^d \chi(nx)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Next choose $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0,1])$ which satisfies $\phi|_{B_1} \equiv 1$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\phi) \subset B_2$. Set $\phi_n(x) = \phi(x/n)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq 1$. Now we define

$$\sigma_n = (\sigma * \chi_n)\, \phi_n \quad \text{and} \quad b_n = (b * \chi_n)\, \phi_n. \tag{3.14}$$

Then for every $n \geq 1$, the functions σ_n and b_n are smooth with compact supports. Consider the following Itô SDE:

$$\mathrm{d}X_t^n = \sigma_n(X_t^n)\, \mathrm{d}B_t + b_n(X_t^n)\, \mathrm{d}t, \quad X_0^n = x. \tag{3.15}$$

This equation has a unique strong solution which gives rise to a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote by K_t^n the Radon–Nikodym density of $(X_t^n)_\# \mu$ with respect to μ. The following uniform estimate on the density functions was established in [34, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 3.4 (Density estimate). *For any $p > 1$, there are two positive constants $C_{1,p}, C_{2,p} > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{n\geq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|K_t^n\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)} \\ &\leq C_{1,p} \bigg(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\big[C_{2,p} T \big([\mathrm{div}(b)]^- + |\bar{b}| + |\nabla\sigma|^2 + |\bar{\sigma}|^2\big)\big]\, \mathrm{d}\mu \bigg)^{\frac{1}{p(p+1)}} < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Let $q_1 \in (1, q)$ and $\Lambda_{q_1,T}$ be the quantity on the right hand side of (3.16) with $p = q/(q - q_1)$, which is finite by (2.6). Then

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|K_t^n\|_{L^{q/(q-q_1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)} \leq \Lambda_{q_1,T} < +\infty. \tag{3.17}$$

Thanks to the moment estimate in Lemma 3.1, we can improve [34, Proposition 2.7] by showing that the sequence of stochastic flows $(X_t^n)_{n\geq 1}$ generated by (3.15) are convergent in $L^2\big(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d, C([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)\big)$.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2.3. There exists a random field $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|X^n - X\|^2_{\infty,T}\, \mathrm{d}\mu = 0.$$

Proof. The proof follows the line of [34, Proposition 2.7]. Applying Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|X_\cdot^n(x)\|^{2q_1}_{\infty,T}\, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \leq C_{d,q_1} + C_{q_1,T} \Lambda_{q_1,T} \big(\|\sigma_n\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)} + \|b_n\|^{2q_1}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}\big), \tag{3.18}$$

where C_{d,q_1} and $C_{q_1,T}$ are positive constants independent on n. We have $|\sigma_n| \leq |\sigma| * \chi_n$. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\|\sigma_n\|^{2q}_{L^{2q}(\mu)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\sigma|^{2q} * \chi_n\big)(x)\, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_n(y)\, \mathrm{d}y \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\sigma(x-y)|^{2q}}{(1+|x|^2)^{q+(d+1)/2}}\, \mathrm{d}x.$$

For $n \geq 2$ and $|y| \leq 1/n$, one has $|x-y|^2 \leq 2|x|^2 + 2|y|^2 \leq 2|x|^2 + 1/2$, hence

$$1 + |x|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|x-y|^2 + \frac{3}{4} \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 + |x-y|^2).$$

Consequently, for $n \geq 2$,

$$\|\sigma_n\|^{2q}_{L^{2q}(\mu)} \leq 2^{q+(d+1)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_n(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\sigma(x-y)|^{2q}}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{q+(d+1)/2}}\,\mathrm{d}x = 2^{q+(d+1)/2}\|\sigma\|^{2q}_{L^{2q}(\mu)}.$$

The same estimate holds for $\|b_n\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}$. Combining these discussions with (3.18), we obtain

$$\sup_{n\geq 2} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|X^n_\cdot(x)\|^{2q_1}_{\infty,T}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x) \leq \hat{C} < +\infty, \tag{3.19}$$

where $\hat{C}$ depends on d, q_1, $\|\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}$ and $\|b\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}$.

For any $x \in B_R$, we deduce from the definition that $b_n(x) = (b * \chi_n)(x)$ for all $n > R$. By (2.3), it is clear that one has

$$|\langle x-y, b_n(x) - b_n(y)\rangle| \leq \big[g^n_{2R}(x) + g^n_{2R}(y)\big]\rho(|x-y|^2) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B_R,$$

where $g^n_{2R} = g_{2R} * \chi_n$. Note that $q_1 \in (1, q)$, Hölder's inequality yields

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|K^n_t\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{P}\times\mu)} \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^d)^{(q_1-1)/q}\Lambda_{q_1,T}, \tag{3.20}$$

where $\Lambda_{q_1,T}$ is the quantity on the right hand side of (3.16) with $p = q/(q-q_1)$. For any $n \geq 1$, we denote by G^n_R the level set of the flow X^n_t on the interval $[0,T]$:

$$G^n_R(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|X^n_\cdot(\omega, x)\|_{\infty,T} \leq R\}.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 to the flows X^n_t and X^l_t gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_{G^n_R \cap G^l_R} \psi_\delta\big(\|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\mathrm{d}\mu \\
&\leq C_{d,R,T}\Lambda_{q_1,T}\bigg[\frac{1}{\delta}\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\Big(\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \|b_n - b_l\|_{L^q(B_R)}\Big) \\
&\qquad + \|\nabla\sigma_n\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|\nabla\sigma_n\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|g^n_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)}\bigg].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

By the definition of σ_n, we have

$$|\nabla\sigma_n| \leq |\nabla\sigma| * \chi_n + C\frac{|\sigma * \chi_n|}{1+|x|} \leq |\nabla\sigma| * \chi_n + 2C|\bar{\sigma}| * \chi_n.$$

From this we can show that

$$\|\nabla\sigma_n\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} \leq C_q\big(\|\nabla\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R+1})} + \|\bar{\sigma}\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R+1})}\big). \tag{3.22}$$

Moreover, $\|g^n_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq \|g_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_{R+1})}$. Hence for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\|\nabla\sigma_n\|^2_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|\nabla\sigma_n\|_{L^{2q}(B_{3R})} + \|g^n_{2R}\|_{L^q(B_R)} \leq C'_{d,q,R} < +\infty.$$

Now we define

$$\delta_{n,l} = \big(\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|_{L^{2q}(B_R)} + \|b_n - b_l\|_{L^q(B_R)}\big)^2$$

which tends to 0 as $n, l \to +\infty$. Taking $\delta = \delta_{n,l}$ in (3.21), we obtain that for any $n, l \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{G_R^n \cap G_R^l} \psi_{\delta_{n,l}}\big(\|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \mathrm{d}\mu \leq C_{T,d,q,q_1,R} < +\infty. \tag{3.23}$$

The moment estimate (3.19) implies

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{(G_R^n \cap G_R^l)^c} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu \leq \mathbb{E}\big\{\mu\big[(G_R^n \cap G_R^l)^c\big]\big\} \leq \frac{4\hat{C}}{R^{2q_1}}.$$

For $\eta \in (0,1)$, set

$$\Sigma_\eta^{n,l}(\omega) = \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|X^n(\omega, x) - X^l(\omega, x)\|_{\infty,T} \leq \eta\big\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \int_{G_R^n \cap G_R^l} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu &\leq \eta \, \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \mathbb{E} \int_{(G_R^n \cap G_R^l) \setminus \Sigma_\eta^{k,l}} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu \\
&\leq \eta \, \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \frac{1}{\psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\eta^2)} \mathbb{E} \int_{G_R^n \cap G_R^l} \psi_{\delta_{n,l}}\big(\|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu \\
&\leq \eta \, \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \frac{C_{T,d,q,q_1,R}}{\psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\eta^2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.23). Combining the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu \leq \frac{4\hat{C}}{R^{2q_1}} + \eta \, \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) + \frac{C_{T,d,q,q_1,R}}{\psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\eta^2)}.$$

Recall that $\delta_{n,l}$ tends to 0 as $n, l \to \infty$, hence, first letting $n, l \to \infty$, and then $R \to +\infty$, $\eta \to 0$, we arrive at

$$\lim_{n,l \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu = 0.$$

Taking into account (3.19), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n,l \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T}^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu = 0.$$

This immediately implies the desired result. □

At this stage, we can use (3.20) and follow the arguments of [18, Theorem 3.4] to show that

Proposition 3.6. *Let $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the random field obtained in Proposition 3.5. For all $t \in [0,T]$, there exists $K_t : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $(X_t)_\# \mu = K_t \mu$. Moreover, $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|K_t\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{P} \times \mu)} \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^d)^{(q_1-1)/q} \Lambda_{q_1,T}$.*

Remark 3.7. *It follows from Proposition 3.6 and Hölder's inequality that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma(X_s(x))|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \mathrm{d}s &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma(y)|^2 K_s(y) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(y) \mathrm{d}s \\
&\leq T \|\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}^2 \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|K_s\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{P} \times \mu)} \\
&\leq T \|\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}^2 \mu(\mathbb{R}^d)^{(q_1-1)/q} \Lambda_{q_1,T} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Fubini's theorem implies $\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\sigma(X_s(x))|^2 \, \mathrm{d}s < \infty$ for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, the process $[0,T] \ni t \to \int_0^t \sigma(X_s(x)) \, \mathrm{d}B_s$ is a square integrable martingale.

To show that $(X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ solves the Itô SDE (1.1), we need the following preparation.

Lemma 3.8. *We have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\int_0^t\big[\sigma_n(X_s^n)-\sigma(X_s)\big]\mathrm{d}B_s\right|^2\mathrm{d}\mu(x)=0$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\int_0^t\big[b_n(X_s^n)-b(X_s)\big]\mathrm{d}s\right|^2\mathrm{d}\mu(x)=0.$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|\sigma_n-\sigma\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}=0\quad\text{and}\quad\lim_{n\to\infty}\|b_n-b\|_{L^{2q}(\mu)}=0.$$

Combining these limits with Propositions 3.5 and 3.6, and making use of the uniform density estimate (3.20), we can finish the proof as in [18, Proposition 4.1]. □

For any $n\ge 1$, we rewrite the equation (3.15) in the integral form:

$$X_t^n(x)=x+\int_0^t\sigma_n(X_s^n)\,\mathrm{d}B_s+\int_0^t b_n(X_s^n)\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.24}$$

When $n\to+\infty$, by Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.8, the two sides of (3.24) converge respectively to X and

$$x+\int_0^{\cdot}\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s+\int_0^{\cdot}b(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Therefore, for almost all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, the following equality holds $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely:

$$X_t(x)=x+\int_0^t\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}B_s+\int_0^t b(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s,\quad\text{for all } t\in[0,T].$$

That is to say, X_t solves SDE (1.1) over the time interval $[0,T]$. By Corollary 3.3, such a solution is also unique, thus we finish the proof of Theorem 2.3.

4 Proof of Theorem 2.5

We shall prove Theorem 2.5 by following the line of arguments in Section 3 and establishing some analogous estimates. We focus on the differences in this setting and will not provide detailed proofs for all the results.

We first give an a-priori estimate on the second moment of the flow. The main difference from Lemma 3.1 is that we adopt here the Lebesgue measure as the reference measure, thus the integral is restricted on a finite ball B_R and the averaged Radon–Nikodym density is assumed to be bounded in the space and time variables.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2.5. Let X_t be a generalized stochastic flow associated to Itô SDE* (1.1) *and K_t its Radon–Nikodym density. Assume that $\Lambda_T:=\sup\{\mathbb{E}K_t(x):(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\}<+\infty$. Then for any $R>0$*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\|X_\cdot(x)\|_{\infty,T}^2\,\mathrm{d}x\le C_{T,r}\big((1+R^2)\mathcal{L}^d(B_R)+T\Lambda_T\|b\|_{L^1(B_r)}\big).$$

where the number r comes from condition (ii) in Theorem 2.5 and the constant $C_{T,r}$ depends on the growth properties of σ,b.

Proof. We follow the idea in *Step 2* of the proof of [44, Theorem 2.2]. For $\lambda > 0$, let $\tau_\lambda(x) = \inf\{t > 0 : |X_t(x)| \geq \lambda\}$. We omit the space variable x to simplify notations. By the Itô formula, for any $t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t}|X_{s\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2 &\leq |x|^2 + 2\,\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t}\int_0^{s\wedge\tau_\lambda}\langle X_u, \sigma(X_u)\,\mathrm{d}B_u\rangle \\ &\quad + 2\,\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t}\int_0^{s\wedge\tau_\lambda}\langle X_u, b(X_u)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}u + \mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t}\int_0^{s\wedge\tau_\lambda}|\sigma(X_u)|^2\,\mathrm{d}u \\ &=: |x|^2 + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t).\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

First, by Burkholder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}I_1(t) &\leq 4\,\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|\sigma(X_u)^*X_u|^2\,\mathrm{d}u\bigg)^{1/2}\bigg] \\ &\leq 4\,\mathbb{E}\bigg[\sup_{u\leq t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|X_u|\cdot\bigg(\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|\sigma(X_u)|^2\,\mathrm{d}u\bigg)^{1/2}\bigg] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{E}\sup_{u\leq t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|X_u|^2 + 8\mathbb{E}\int_0^t|\sigma(X_{u\wedge\tau_\lambda})|^2\,\mathrm{d}u,\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Cauchy's inequality. Since σ is bounded, we arrive at

$$I_1(t) \leq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{E}\sup_{u\leq t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|X_u|^2 + C_1 t. \tag{4.2}$$

Similarly,

$$I_3(t) \leq C_1 t. \tag{4.3}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}I_2(t) &\leq 2\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|\langle X_u, b(X_u)\rangle|\big(\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|\leq r\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|>r\}}\big)\,\mathrm{d}u \\ &\leq 2r\mathbb{E}\int_0^t|b(X_u)|\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|\leq r\}}\,\mathrm{d}u + 2\mathbb{E}\int_0^t C_2(1+|X_{u\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2)\,\mathrm{d}u.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where in the last step we used the linear growth property of b outside the ball B_r. Denote by

$$\xi_t = \mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t}|X_{s\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2 = \mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|X_s|^2.$$

Combining (4.1)–(4.4) yields

$$\xi_t \leq 2|x|^2 + 4r\mathbb{E}\int_0^t|b(X_u)|\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|\leq r\}}\,\mathrm{d}u + C_3\int_0^t(1+\xi_u)\,\mathrm{d}u.$$

Gronwall's inequality gives us

$$\xi_T \leq C_{T,r}\bigg(1 + |x|^2 + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T|b(X_u)|\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|\leq r\}}\,\mathrm{d}u\bigg).$$

By the definition of Λ_T, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\sup_{s\leq T\wedge\tau_\lambda}|X_s|^2\,\mathrm{d}x &\leq C_{T,r}\bigg((1+R^2)\mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + \int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}|b(X_u)|\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_u|\leq r\}}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}u\bigg) \\ &\leq C_{T,r}\bigg((1+R^2)\mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + \int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_r}|b(y)|K_u(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}u\bigg) \\ &\leq C_{T,r}\big((1+R^2)\mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + T\Lambda_T\|b\|_{L^1(B_r)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Since the right hand side is independent of λ, Fatou's lemma yields the desired result. □

Next we shall establish in the current setting a stability estimate which is similar to Lemma 3.2. Recall the definition of ψ_δ in Section 2.

Lemma 4.2 (Stability estimate). *Suppose that $\sigma, \tilde\sigma \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{M}_{d\times m})$ and $b, \tilde b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, σ and b satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 2.5. Let X_t (resp. $\tilde X_t$) be the $\mathcal{L}^d$-a.e. stochastic flow associated to the Itô SDE* (1.1) *with coefficients σ and b (resp. $\tilde\sigma$ and $\tilde b$). Denote by K_t (resp. $\tilde K_t$) the Radon–Nikodym density of X_t (resp. $\tilde X_t$) with respect to $\mathcal{L}^d$. Assume that*

$$\Lambda_T := \sup_{0\le t\le T,\, x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \big[\mathbb{E}K_t(x) \vee \mathbb{E}\tilde K_t(x)\big] < +\infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda} \psi_\delta\big(\|X-\tilde X\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_{d,R,T}\bigg[1 + \|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)} + \frac{1}{\delta}\|\sigma-\tilde\sigma\|^2_{L^2(B_\lambda)} \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\big(\|\sigma-\tilde\sigma\|_{L^2(B_\lambda)} + \|b-\tilde b\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}\big)\bigg],\end{aligned}$$

where $G_\lambda(\omega) := \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : \|X_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T} \vee \|\tilde X_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T} \le \lambda\big\}$ and $C_{d,R,T}$ depends on d, R, T and Λ_T.

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 3.2. Denote by $Z_t = X_t - \tilde X_t$ and $\xi_t = |Z_t|^2$ where we omit the space variable x. By Itô's formula, we still have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\psi_\delta(\xi_t) &\le 2\frac{\langle Z_t, (\sigma(X_t)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_t))\,\mathrm{d}B_t\rangle}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta} + 2\frac{\langle Z_t, b(X_t)-\tilde b(\tilde X_t)\rangle}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\|\sigma(X_t)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_t)\|^2}{\rho(\xi_t)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &=: \mathrm{d}I_1(t) + \mathrm{d}I_2(t) + \mathrm{d}I_3(t).\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

We first estimate the term $I_1(t)$. For any $x\in B_R$ and $\lambda > 0$, we define $\tau_\lambda(x) = \inf\{t>0 : |X_t(x)| \vee |\tilde X_t(x)| > \lambda\}$. Note that $B_R\cap G_\lambda \subset \{x\in B_R : \tau_\lambda(x) > T\}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_\lambda} |I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.7}$$

By Burkholder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_\lambda} |I_1(t)|^2 &\le 4\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda} \frac{\big|(\sigma(X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s))^* Z_s\big|^2}{(\rho(\xi_s)+\delta)^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le 4\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda} \frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\end{aligned}$$

since $\rho(\xi)\ge\xi\ge 0$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_\lambda}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \int_{B_R} 2\bigg[\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2}\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le C_R\bigg[\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}x\bigg]^{1/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where $C_R = 2(\mathcal{L}_d(B_R))^{1/2}$. Since $\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\| \le \|\sigma(X_s)-\sigma(\tilde X_s)\| + \|\sigma(\tilde X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|$ and σ is globally Lipschitz continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_\lambda}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x &\le C_{R,T} + \sqrt{2}C_R\bigg[\int_{B_R}\mathbb{E}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\|\sigma(\tilde X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|^2}{\xi_s+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}x\bigg]^{1/2} \\ &\le C_{R,T} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\delta}}\,C_R\bigg[\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\|\sigma(\tilde X_s)-\tilde\sigma(\tilde X_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s\bigg]^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we have used the Fubini theorem. We have by (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\|\sigma(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_\lambda}\|\sigma(y)-\tilde{\sigma}(y)\|^2\tilde{K}_s(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &\le \Lambda_T\int_{B_\lambda}\|\sigma(y)-\tilde{\sigma}(y)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

Combining these arguments with (4.7) gives us

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_1(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_{R,T}+\sqrt{\frac{2T\Lambda_T}{\delta}}\,C_R\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(B_\lambda)}. \tag{4.9}$$

Next, we treat the second term $I_2(t)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\sup_{0\le t\le T\wedge\tau_\lambda}|I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le 2\,\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{|\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}x\\ &= 2\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\frac{|\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle| \le |\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|+|\langle Z_s,b(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|$. We deduce from $(\mathbf{H}_1)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\frac{|\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\big[g_{2\lambda}(X_s)+g_{2\lambda}(\tilde{X}_s)\big]\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_\lambda}g_{2\lambda}(y)\big[K_s(y)+\tilde{K}_s(y)\big]\,\mathrm{d}y,\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (4.5), gives us

$$\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\frac{|\langle Z_s,b(X_s)-b(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \le 2T\Lambda_T\|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}.$$

Moreover, using again the fact that $\rho(\xi)\ge\xi\ge 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\frac{|\langle Z_s,b(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)\rangle|}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\le \int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\lambda>s\}}\frac{|b(\tilde{X}_s)-\tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_s)|}{\sqrt{\xi_s+\delta}}\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s\\ &\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\int_{B_\lambda}|b(y)-\tilde{b}(y)|\tilde{K}_s(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}s\\ &\le \frac{T\Lambda_T}{\sqrt{\delta}}\|b-\tilde{b}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_2(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x \le 2T\Lambda_T\left(2\|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\|b-\tilde{b}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}\right). \tag{4.10}$$

Finally, the term $I_3(t)$ can be estimated as that on the right hand side of (4.8), thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|I_3(t)|\,\mathrm{d}x &\le \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R}\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\|\sigma(X_s)-\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s)\|^2}{\rho(\xi_s)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le C_{R,T}+\frac{2}{\delta}T\Lambda_T\|\sigma-\tilde{\sigma}\|^2_{L^2(B_\lambda)}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain the desired result. □

Now we start to prove the existence of generalized stochastic flow associated to (1.1). In order to apply Lemma 4.2, we need a uniform estimate on the Radon–Nikodym densities. First, in the smooth case, we have (see [42, Lemma 3.1] for its proof)

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that σ and b are smooth with compact supports. Then for any $p \geq 1$, the Radon–Nikodym density $K_t := \frac{\mathrm{d}(X_t)_{\#}\mathcal{L}^d}{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^d}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}K_t^p(x)\\ &\leq \exp\left\{pT\left\|\Big(\frac{p}{2}|\mathrm{div}(\sigma)|^2 - \mathrm{div}(b) + \sum_{k=1}^m\sum_{i,j=1}^d \Big[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_i\sigma^{jk})(\partial_j\sigma^{ik}) + \sigma^{ik}\partial_{ij}\sigma^{jk}\Big]\Big)^+\right\|_\infty\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{div}(\sigma) = (\mathrm{div}(\sigma^{1\cdot}), \cdots, \mathrm{div}(\sigma^{m\cdot}))$ *are the divergences of the column vectors of* σ.

Let b_n be defined as in (3.14). Moreover, $\sigma_n := \sigma\,\phi_n$. Then for every $n \geq 1$, the functions σ_n and b_n are smooth with compact supports. Consider the following Itô's SDE:

$$\mathrm{d}X_t^n = \sigma_n(X_t^n)\,\mathrm{d}B_t + b_n(X_t^n)\,\mathrm{d}t, \quad X_0^n = x \tag{4.11}$$

which gives rise to a stochastic flow $(X_t^n)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ of diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote by K_t^n the Radon–Nikodym density of $(X_t^n)_{\#}\mathcal{L}^d$ with respect to $\mathcal{L}^d$. Then as in the proof of [44, Theorem 2.6], we can show that

Lemma 4.4 (Uniform density estimate). *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.5, for any $p \geq 1$, one has*

$$\Lambda_{p,T} := \sup_{n\geq 1}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[K_t^n(x)]^p < +\infty. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[K_t^n(x)]^p\\ &\leq \exp\left\{pT\left\|\Big(\frac{p}{2}|\mathrm{div}(\sigma_n)|^2 - \mathrm{div}(b_n) + \sum_{k=1}^m\sum_{i,j=1}^d \Big[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_i\sigma_n^{jk})(\partial_j\sigma_n^{ik}) + \sigma_n^{ik}\partial_{ij}\sigma_n^{jk}\Big]\Big)^+\right\|_\infty\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Under the condition (i) of Theorem 2.5, it is clear that

$$|\mathrm{div}(\sigma_n)|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^m\sum_{i,j=1}^d \Big(\frac{1}{2}\big|\partial_i\sigma_n^{jk})(\partial_j\sigma_n^{ik})\big| + \big|\sigma_n^{ik}\partial_{ij}\sigma_n^{jk}\big|\Big) \leq C_1 < \infty, \tag{4.14}$$

where C_1 is independent of n. Recall the definition of ϕ_n above (3.14). We have

$$|\nabla\phi_n(x)| \leq \frac{\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty}{n}\mathbf{1}_{\{n\leq|x|\leq 2n\}} \leq \frac{3\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty}{1+|x|}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\geq n\}}.$$

By (2.7), for all $n \geq r+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathrm{div}(b_n) &= -[\mathrm{div}(b) * \chi_n]\phi_n - \langle b*\chi_n, \nabla\phi_n\rangle\\ &\leq \big\|[\mathrm{div}(b)]^-\big\|_\infty + 3\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty\frac{|b*\chi_n|}{1+|x|}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\geq n\}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

For any $y \in B_1$, one has $1+|x-y| \leq 2+|x| \leq 2(1+|x|)$, therefore, for $|x| \geq n \geq r+1$,

$$\frac{|(b*\chi_n)(x)|}{1+|x|} \leq 2(|\bar{b}|*\chi_n)(x) \leq 2\|\bar{b}\|_{L^\infty(B_r^c)}.$$

Combining this estimate with (4.13)–(4.15), we finish the proof. □

Using Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we can now show that the sequence of stochastic flows generated by (4.11) strongly converges to a random field $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2.5. Then there exists a random field $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any $p \in [1,2)$ and $R > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \|X^n - X\|^p_{\infty,T} \,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.5. For any $n \geq 1$, we denote by G^n_λ the level set of the flow X^n_t on the interval $[0,T]$:

$$G^n_\lambda(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|X^n_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T} \leq \lambda\}.$$

Applying Lemmas 4.1 and 4.4 to the flows X^n_t gives us

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} \int_{B_R} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t\leq T} |X^n_t(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \leq C < +\infty, \tag{4.16}$$

in which C depends on $d, T, R, \Lambda_{1,T}$ and $\|b\|_{L^1(B_{r+1})}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathcal{L}^d\big(B_R \cap (G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda)^c\big)\big] \leq \mathbb{E}\big[\mathcal{L}^d\big(B_R \cap (G^n_\lambda)^c\big)\big] + \mathbb{E}\big[\mathcal{L}^d\big(B_R \cap (G^l_\lambda)^c\big)\big] \leq \frac{2C}{\lambda^2}. \tag{4.17}$$

Next, by Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R \cap G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda} \psi_\delta\big(\|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C_{d,R,T}\bigg[1 + \|g^n_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)} + \frac{1}{\delta}\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|^2_{L^2(B_\lambda)} \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}}\big(\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|_{L^2(B_\lambda)} + \|b_n - b_l\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}\big)\bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Now we define

$$\delta_{n,l} = \big(\|\sigma_n - \sigma_l\|_{L^2(B_\lambda)} + \|b_n - b_l\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}\big)^2$$

which tends to 0 as $n, l \to +\infty$. Taking $\delta = \delta_{n,l}$ in (4.18), we obtain that for any $n, l \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R \cap G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda} \psi_{\delta_{n,l}}\big(\|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_{d,R,T}\big[3 + \|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_{\lambda+1})}\big] =: C_{d,R,T,\lambda} < \infty. \tag{4.19}$$

Next for $\eta \in (0,1)$, set

$$\Theta^{n,l}_\eta = \big\{(\omega,x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d : \|X^n - X^l\|_{\infty,T} \leq \eta\big\}.$$

We have by (4.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_{B_R} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\big[\mathcal{L}^d\big(B_R \cap (G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda)^c\big)\big] + \mathbb{E} \int_{B_R \cap G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \frac{2C}{\lambda^2} + \eta^2 \mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + \frac{1}{\psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\eta^2)} \mathbb{E} \int_{(B_R \cap G^n_\lambda \cap G^l_\lambda)\setminus \Theta^{n,l}_\eta} \psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}) \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \frac{2C}{\lambda^2} + \eta^2 \mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + \frac{C_{d,R,T,\lambda}}{\psi_{\delta_{n,l}}(\eta^2)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where the last inequality follows from (4.19). First letting $n, l \to +\infty$, and then $\lambda \to +\infty$, $\eta \to 0$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n,l\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big(1 \wedge \|X^n - X^l\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

Due to (4.16), we have for any $p \in [1,2)$,

$$\lim_{n,l\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \|X^n - X^l\|^p_{\infty,T}\,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

Hence there exists a random field $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \|X^n - X\|^p_{\infty,T}\,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

Remark 4.6. *From the above proof, we see that for any $p \in [1,2)$, the limit random field belongs to the space $L^p(\Omega \times B_R, C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d))$ for all $R > 0$.*

Finally we can present the

Proof of Theorem 2.5. In view of Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.5, we can directly apply [44, Lemma 3.4] to show that for all $t \in [0,T]$, there exists $K_t : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $(X_t)_{\#}\mathcal{L}^d = K_t\mathcal{L}^d$; moreover, $\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}K_t(x) < \infty$. By the same arguments as those at the end of Section 3, we can prove that $(X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ constructed in Proposition 4.5 is an $\mathcal{L}^d$-a.e. stochastic flow associated to the Itô SDE (1.1).

The uniqueness of $\mathcal{L}^d$-a.e. stochastic flows follow from Lemma 4.2. Indeed, let $(X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ and $(\tilde{X}_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ be two generalized flows associated to the Itô SDE (1.1). For any $\lambda > R > 0$, applying Lemma 4.2 with $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma$ and $\tilde{b} = b$ leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R\cap G_\lambda} \psi_\delta\big(\|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \le C_{d,T,R}\big(1 + \|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_\lambda)}\big) =: C_{d,T,R,\lambda}. \tag{4.21}$$

For any $\eta \in (0,1)$, let $\Theta_\eta(\omega) := \{x \in B_R : \|X_\cdot(\omega,x) - \tilde{X}_\cdot(\omega,x)\|_{\infty,T} \le \eta\}$. Then, analogous to (4.20), we can deduce from Lemma 4.1 and (4.21) that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{C_{T,R,r}}{\lambda^2} + \eta^2\mathcal{L}^d(B_R) + \frac{C_{d,T,R,\lambda}}{\psi_\delta(\eta^2)}.$$

We first let $\delta \downarrow 0$, then let $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ and $\eta \downarrow 0$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{B_R} \big(1 \wedge \|X - \tilde{X}\|^2_{\infty,T}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0,$$

which yields the uniqueness since $R > 0$ is arbitrary. □

5 Uniqueness of Fokker–Planck equations

This last section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.7. We first give some preparations which are mainly taken from [33, Section 2], see also the beginning parts of [38, Sections 1 and 2]. Denote by $\mathbb{W}^n_T = C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of continuous functions from $[0,T]$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{F}^n_t$ be the canonical filtration generated by coordinate process $W_t(w) = w_t$, $w \in \mathbb{W}^n_T$. Recall that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the set of probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. To fix the notations, we state in detail the two well known notions of solutions to (1.1).

Definition 5.1 (Martingale solution). *Given $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a probability measure P_{μ_0} on $(\mathbb{W}_T^d, \mathcal{F}_T^d)$ is called a martingale solution to SDE* (1.1) *with initial distribution μ_0 if $P_{\mu_0} \circ w_0^{-1} = \mu_0$, and for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varphi(w_t) - \varphi(w_0) - \int_0^t L\varphi(w_s)\,\mathrm{d}s$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_t^d)$-martingale under P_{μ_0}, where L is the second order differential operator given in* (2.9).

Definition 5.2 (Weak solution). *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The SDE* (1.1) *is said to have a weak solution with initial law μ_0 if there exist a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P)$, on which are defined a $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-adapted continuous process X_t taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and an m-dimensional standard $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-Brownian motion W_t, such that X_0 is distributed as μ_0 and a.s.,*

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s + \int_0^t b(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T].$$

We denote this solution by $\big(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P; X, W\big)$.

The next result can be found in the proof of [25, Chap. IV, Theorem 1.1].

Proposition 5.3. *Given two weak solutions $\big(\Omega^{(i)}, \mathcal{G}^{(i)}, \big(\mathcal{G}_t^{(i)}\big)_{0\le t\le T}, P^{(i)}; X^{(i)}, W^{(i)}\big)$, $i = 1, 2$ to SDE* (1.1)*, having the same initial law $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exist a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P)$, a standard m-dimensional $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-Brownian motion W_t and two $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-adapted continuous processes $Y^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $P\big(Y_0^{(1)} = Y_0^{(2)}\big) = 1$ and for $i = 1, 2$, $X^{(i)}$ and $Y^{(i)}$ have the same distributions in $\mathbb{W}_T^d$, and $\big(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P; Y^{(i)}, W\big)$ is a weak solution of SDE* (1.1).

The assertion below is a special case of [25, Chap. IV, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 5.4 (Existence of martingale solution implies that of weak solution). *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and P_{μ_0} be a martingale solution of SDE* (1.1)*. Then there exists a weak solution $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P; X, W)$ to SDE* (1.1) *such that $P \circ X^{-1} = P_{\mu_0}$.*

Finally we recall the following result which is a consequence of Figalli's representation theorem (see [22, Theorem 2.6]) for solutions to the Fokker–Planck equation (2.8).

Proposition 5.5. *Assume that σ and b are two bounded measurable functions. Given $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a measure-valued solution to equation* (2.8) *with initial value μ_0. Then there exists a martingale solution P_{μ_0} to SDE* (1.1) *with initial law μ_0 such that for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(x) = \int_{\mathbb{W}_T^d} \varphi(w_t)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mu_0}(w), \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T].$$

Now we are ready to present

Proof of Theorem 2.7. We follow the idea of the proof of [33, Theorem 1.2] (see also [38, Theorem 1.1]). Let $u_t^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$ be two weak solutions to (2.10) in the class $L^\infty\big([0,T], L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\big)$ with the same initial value f. Set $\mathrm{d}\mu_0(x) = f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$. By Proposition 5.5, there exist two martingale solutions $P_{\mu_0}^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$ to the SDE (1.1) with the same initial probability distribution μ_0, such that for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) u_t^{(i)}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)} \varphi(w_t)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mu_0}^{(i)}(w), \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.1}$$

Proposition 5.4 implies that there are two weak solutions $\big(\Omega^{(i)}, \mathcal{G}^{(i)}, \big(\mathcal{G}_t^{(i)}\big)_{0\le t\le T}, P^{(i)}; X^{(i)}, W^{(i)}\big)$, $i = 1, 2$ to SDE (1.1) satisfying $P^{(i)} \circ \big(X^{(i)}\big)^{-1} = P_{\mu_0}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$. Finally, by Proposition 5.3, we can find a common filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{0\le t\le T}, P)$, on which are defined a

standard m-dimensional $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-Brownian motion W and two continuous $(\mathcal{G}_t)$-adapted processes $Y^{(i)}\,(i=1,2)$, such that $P\big(Y_0^{(1)}=Y_0^{(2)}\big)=1$ and $Y^{(i)}$ is distributed as $P_{\mu_0}^{(i)}$ on $C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$; moreover for $i=1,2$, it holds a.s. that

$$Y_t^{(i)}=Y_0^{(i)}+\int_0^t b\big(Y_s^{(i)}\big)\,\mathrm{d}s+\int_0^t \sigma\big(Y_s^{(i)}\big)\,\mathrm{d}W_s\quad\text{for all } t\le T.$$

Set $Z_t=Y_t^{(1)}-Y_t^{(2)}$ and for $\lambda>0$, define the stopping time $\tau_\lambda=\inf\big\{t\in[0,T]:\big|Y_t^{(1)}\big|\vee\big|Y_t^{(2)}\big|\ge\lambda\big\}$ with the convention that $\inf\emptyset=T$. Since the coefficients σ and b are bounded, it is clear that

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\tau_\lambda(\omega)=T\quad\text{almost surely.}\tag{5.2}$$

Fix $\delta>0$. We have by Itô's formula that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\delta\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2\big)&=\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{2\big\langle Z_s,b\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-b\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\rangle+\big\|\sigma\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\|^2}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\\&\quad+2\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\big\langle Z_s,\big[\sigma\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big]\,\mathrm{d}W_s\big\rangle}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\\&\quad-2\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\rho'(|Z_s|^2)\frac{\big\|\big[\sigma\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big]^*Z_s\big\|^2}{(\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta)^2}\,\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho'\ge0$, taking expectation on both sides with respect to P yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\psi_\delta\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2\big)&\le\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\big\|\sigma\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\|^2}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s+2\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\big\langle Z_s,b\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-b\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\rangle}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\\&=:I_1+I_2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.3}$$

We shall estimate the two terms in the next two steps, respectively.

Step 1. We first deal with the term I_1. Let σ_n be defined as in (3.14). By the triangular inequality, for any $n\ge1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_1&\le3\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\big\|\sigma_n\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma_n\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\|^2}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\\&\quad+3\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}\frac{\big\|\sigma_n\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(1)}\big)\big\|^2+\big\|\sigma_n\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)-\sigma\big(Y_s^{(2)}\big)\big\|^2}{\rho(|Z_s|^2)+\delta}\,\mathrm{d}s\\&=:I_{1,1}+I_{1,2}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.4}$$

To estimate the first term $I_{1,1}$, we shall use the hypothesis $(\mathbf{H}_\sigma)$. Fix any $x,y\in B_\lambda$, when $n>\lambda$, we have

$$\|\sigma_n(x)-\sigma_n(y)\|=\|(\sigma*\chi_n)(x)-(\sigma*\chi_n)(y)\|\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\sigma(x-z)-\sigma(y-z)\|\chi_n(z)\,\mathrm{d}z.$$

Note that $(x-N)\cup(y-N)$ is a negligible set. For any $z\notin(x-N)\cup(y-N)$, one has $x-z\notin N$ and $y-z\notin N$. Thus by Cauchy's inequality and $(\mathbf{H}_\sigma)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sigma_n(x)-\sigma_n(y)\|^2&\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|\sigma(x-z)-\sigma(y-z)\|^2\chi_n(z)\,\mathrm{d}z\\&\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(\tilde g_{2\lambda}(x-z)+\tilde g_{2\lambda}(y-z)\big)\rho(|x-y|^2)\chi_n(z)\,\mathrm{d}z\\&=\big(\tilde g_{2\lambda}^n(x)+\tilde g_{2\lambda}^n(y)\big)\rho(|x-y|^2),\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

where $\tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda} = \tilde{g}_{2\lambda} * \chi_n$ is the convolution. Thus, if $n > \lambda$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &\le 3\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} \big[\tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big) + \tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\big]\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le 3\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \Big[\tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(1)}_s|\le\lambda\}} + \tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(2)}_s|\le\lambda\}}\Big]\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $Y^{(i)}_s$ has the same law with $X^{(i)}_s$, which is distributed as $u^{(i)}_s(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $i = 1, 2$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &\le 3\int_0^t\int_{B_\lambda} \tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}(x)\big(u^{(1)}_s(x) + u^{(2)}_s(x)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le 3\sum_{i=1}^2 \big\|u^{(i)}\big\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))}\int_0^t\int_{B_\lambda} \tilde{g}^n_{2\lambda}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \tilde{C}T\|\tilde{g}_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_{\lambda+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the bound is independent of $n \ge 1$. In the same way,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,2} &\le \frac{3}{\delta}\sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \big\|\sigma_n\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big) - \sigma\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big)\big\|^2\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(i)}_s|\le\lambda\}}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{3}{\delta}\sum_{i=1}^2\int_0^t\int_{B_\lambda} \|\sigma_n(x) - \sigma(x)\|^2 u^{(i)}_s(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{3T}{\delta}\sum_{i=1}^2 \big\|u^{(i)}\big\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))}\int_{B_\lambda} \|\sigma_n(x) - \sigma(x)\|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

which vanishes as $n \to \infty$, since $\sigma \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Combining the above two estimates and letting $n \to \infty$ on the right hand side of (5.4), we obtain

$$I_1 \le \tilde{C}T\|\tilde{g}_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_{\lambda+1})} =: \tilde{C}_{T,\lambda} < +\infty. \tag{5.6}$$

Step 2. The estimate of the second term I_2 is analogous to that of I_1. Recall the definition of b_n in (3.14). Then similar to (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= 2\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} \frac{\big\langle Z_s, b_n\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big) - b_n\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\big\rangle}{\rho(|Z_s|^2) + \delta}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + 2\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} \frac{\big\langle Z_s, b\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big) - b_n\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big)\big\rangle + \big\langle Z_s, b_n\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big) - b\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\big\rangle}{\rho(|Z_s|^2) + \delta}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &=: I_{2,1} + I_{2,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

The estimate of the term $I_{2,2}$ is analogous to that of $I_{1,2}$: since $\rho(s) \ge s \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,2} &\le 2\sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} \frac{\big|b_n\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big) - b\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big)\big|}{\sqrt{|Z_s|^2 + \delta}}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{2}{\sqrt{\delta}}\sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \big|b_n\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big) - b\big(Y^{(i)}_s\big)\big|\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(i)}_s|\le\lambda\}}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{2}{\sqrt{\delta}}\sum_{i=1}^2\int_0^t\int_{B_\lambda} |b_n(x) - b(x)|u^{(i)}_s(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

Since $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$I_{2,2} \le \frac{2T}{\sqrt{\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big\|u^{(i)}\big\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))} \int_{B_\lambda} |b_n(x) - b(x)| \, \mathrm{d}x \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.8}$$

Finally we deal with the term $I_{2,1}$. By (2.3), similar computations as in (5.5) lead to

$$|\langle x-y, b_n(x) - b_n(y)\rangle| \le \big(g^n_{2\lambda}(x) + g^n_{2\lambda}(y)\big)\rho(|x-y|^2) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B_\lambda \text{ and } n > \lambda.$$

Therefore, for any $n > \lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,1} &\le 2\,\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} \big[g^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big) + g^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\big] \, \mathrm{d}s \\ &\le 2\,\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t} \Big[g^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(1)}_s\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(1)}_s|\le\lambda\}} + g^n_{2\lambda}\big(Y^{(2)}_s\big)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y^{(2)}_s|\le\lambda\}}\Big] \, \mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

Then, analogous to the above calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,1} &\le 2\sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_0^t \int_{B_\lambda} g^n_{2\lambda}(x) u^{(i)}_s(x) \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le 2T \sum_{i=1}^{2} \big\|u^{(i)}\big\|_{L^\infty([0,T],L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))} \|g_{2\lambda}\|_{L^1(B_{\lambda+1})} =: \hat{C}_{T,\lambda} < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This estimate together with (5.7) and (5.8) yields

$$I_2 \le \hat{C}_{T,\lambda} < +\infty. \tag{5.9}$$

Step 3. Combining (5.3), (5.6) and (5.9), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\psi_\delta\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2\big) \le \bar{C}_{T,\lambda} < +\infty,$$

where $\bar{C}_{T,\lambda} = \tilde{C}_{T,\lambda} + \hat{C}_{T,\lambda}$. Fix any $\eta > 0$. The above inequality implies

$$P\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}| > \eta\big) \le \frac{\mathbb{E}\psi_\delta\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}|^2\big)}{\psi_\delta(\eta^2)} \le \frac{\bar{C}_{T,\lambda}}{\psi_\delta(\eta^2)}.$$

Letting $\delta \downarrow 0$, we arrive at $P\big(|Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda}| > \eta\big) = 0$. Since η can be arbitrarily small, it follows that $Z_{t\wedge\tau_\lambda} = 0$ almost surely. Finally, we conclude from (5.2) that for any $t \in [0,T]$, $Z_t = Y^{(1)}_t - Y^{(2)}_t = 0$ a.s. The continuity of the two processes $Y^{(1)}_t$ and $Y^{(2)}_t$ yields that, almost surely, $Y^{(1)}_t = Y^{(2)}_t$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Therefore $P^{(1)}_{\mu_0} = P^{(2)}_{\mu_0}$, which, together with the representation formula (5.1), leads to the uniqueness of solutions to (2.10). □

References

[1] H. Airault, J.-G. Ren, Modulus of continuity of the canonic Brownian motion "on the group of diffeomorphisms of the circle". *J. Funct. Anal.* **196** (2002), no. 2, 395–426.

[2] L. Ambrosio, Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields. *Invent. Math.* **158** (2004), 227–260.

[3] L. Ambrosio, The flow associated to weakly differentiable vector fields: recent results and open problems, In: "Nonlinear Conservation Laws and Applications", A. Bressan et al. (eds.), The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications 153, Springer, 2011, 181–193.

[4] L. Ambrosio, A. Figalli, On flows associated to Sobolev vector fields in Wiener space: an approach à la Di Perna–Lions. *J. Funct. Anal.* **256** (2009), no. 1, 179–214.

[5] V.I. Bogachev, G. Da Prato, M. Röckner, W. Stannat, Uniqueness of solutions to weak parabolic equations for measures. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **39** (2007), no. 4, 631–640.

[6] V.I. Bogachev, N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, S.V. Shaposhnikov, Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 207. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2015.

[7] V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner, S.V. Shaposhnikov, On uniqueness of solutions to the Cauchy problem for degenerate Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations. *J. Evol. Equ.* **13**, (2013), no. 3, 577–593.

[8] V.I. Bogachev, M. Röckner, S.V. Shaposhnikov, Uniqueness problems for degenerate Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations. *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* 207 (2015), no. 2, Problems in mathematical analysis. No. 78 (Russian), 147–165.

[9] F. Bouchut, G. Crippa, Lagrangian flows for vector fields with gradient given by a singular integral. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.* **10**, (2013), 235–282.

[10] F. Cipriano, A.B. Cruzeiro, Flows associated with irregular $\mathbb{R}^d$-vector fields. *J. Differential Equations* **210** (2005), 183–201.

[11] G. Crippa, C. de Lellis, Estimates and regularity results for the Di Perna–Lions flows. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **616** (2008), 15–46.

[12] R.J. Di Perna, P.L. Lions, Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces. *Invent. Math.* **98** (1989), 511–547.

[13] H.S. Dumas, F. Golse, P. Lochak, Multiphase averaging for generalized flows on manifolds. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 14 (1994), no. 1, 53–67.

[14] Shizan Fang, Canonical Brownian motion on the diffeomorphism group of the circle. *J. Funct. Anal.* **196** (2002), no. 1, 162–179.

[15] Shizan Fang, Solving stochastic differential equations on Homeo(S^1). *J. Funct. Anal.* **216** (2004), no. 1, 22–46.

[16] Shizan Fang, Huaiqian Li, Dejun Luo, Heat semi-group and generalized flows on complete Riemannian manifolds. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **135** (2011), 565–600.

[17] Shizan Fang, Dejun Luo, Transport equations and quasi-invariant flows on the Wiener space. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **134** (2010), 295–328.

[18] Shizan Fang, Dejun Luo, Anton Thalmaier, Stochastic differential equations with coefficients in Sobolev spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.* **259** (2010), no. 5, 1129–1168.

[19] Shizan Fang, Tusheng Zhang, A class of stochastic differential equations with non-Lipschitzian coefficients: pathwise uniqueness and no explosion. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **337** (2003), no. 11, 737–740.

[20] Shizan Fang, Tusheng Zhang, A study of a class of stochastic differential equations with non-Lipschitzian coefficients. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 132 (2005), no. 3, 356–390.

[21] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, Hölder Flow and Differentiability for SDEs with Nonregular Drift. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* **31** (2013), 708–736.

[22] A. Figalli, Existence and uniqueness of martingale solutions for SDEs with rough or degenerate coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.* **254** (2008), 109–153.

[23] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, E. Priola, Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.* **180** (2010), no. 1, 1–53.

[24] P. Hajłasz, Sobolev spaces on an arbitrary metric space. *Potential Anal.* **5** (1996), 403–415.

[25] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe, Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes, 2nd ed., North-Holland, 1989.

[26] I.A. Ivanishko, Generalized Sobolev classes on metric measure spaces. (Russian) *Mat. Zametki* **77** (2005), no. 6, 937–941; translation in *Math. Notes* **77** (2005), no. 5–6, 865–869.

[27] I.A. Ivanishko, V.G. Krotov, Compactness of embeddings of Sobolev type on metric measure spaces. (Russian. Russian summary) *Mat. Zametki* **86** (2009), no. 6, 829–844; translation in *Math. Notes* **86** (2009), no. 5–6, 775–788.

[28] N.V. Krylov, M. Röckner, Strong solutions of stochastic equations with singular time dependent drift. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **131** (2005), no. 2, 154–196.

[29] H. Kunita, "Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differentail Equations", Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[30] C. Le Bris, P.L. Lions, Existence and uniqueness of solutions to Fokker-Planck type equations with irregular coefficients. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **33** (2008), 1272–1317.

[31] Huaiqian Li, Dejun Luo, A unified treatment for ODEs under Osgood and Sobolev type conditions. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **139** (2015), no. 1, 114–133.

[32] Dejun Luo, Fokker–Planck type equations with Sobolev diffusion coefficients and BV drift coefficients. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* **29** (2013), no. 2, 303–314.

[33] Dejun Luo, Uniqueness of degenerate Fokker–Planck equations with weakly differentiable drift whose gradient is given by a singular integral. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **19** (2014), no. 43, 14 pp.

[34] Dejun Luo, Generalized stochastic flow associated to the Itô SDE with partially Sobolev coefficients and its application. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* **14** (2015), no. 2, 535–573.

[35] P. Malliavin, The canonic diffusion above the diffeomorphism group of the circle. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* **329** (1999), 325–329.

[36] Jiagang Ren, Xicheng Zhang, Stochastic flow for SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **127** (2003), no. 8, 739–754.

[37] Jiagang Ren, Xicheng Zhang, Freidlin-Wentzell's large deviations for homeomorphism flows of non-Lipschitz SDEs. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **129** (2005), no. 8, 643–655.

[38] M. Röckner, X. Zhang, Weak uniqueness of Fokker–Planck equations with degenerate and bounded coefficients. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **348** (2010), 435–438.

[39] Dario Trevisan, Lagrangian flows driven by BV fields in Wiener spaces. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **163** (2015), no. 1–2, 123–147.

[40] Feng-Yu Wang. Semi-Linear SPDE with Multiplicative Noise and Non-Hölder Drift. arXiv:1404.2990v1.

[41] Xicheng Zhang, Homeomorphic flows for multi-dimensional SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **115** (2005), no. 3, 435–448.

[42] Xicheng Zhang, Stochastic flows of SDEs with irregular coefficients and stochastic transport equations. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **134** (2010), 340–378.

[43] Xicheng Zhang, Quasi-invariant stochastic flows of SDEs with non-smooth drifts on compact manifolds. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **121** (2011), no. 6, 1373–1388.

[44] Xicheng Zhang, Well-posedness and large deviation for degenerate SDEs with Sobolev coefficients. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **29** (2013), no. 1, 25–62.